

REMARKS

The Office Action of November 17, 2011 has been carefully studied. The Examiner is thanked for suggesting language which will avoid the rejections on the ground of indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph, as follows:

Claim 1

Lines 2-3, the expression “the liquid phase” is now changed to --a liquid phase--.

Claim 2

The Examiner’s suggestion is adopted by changing “liquefying said CO₂” to --the liquefying of said CO₂--; line 3, “pressure” is now modified as --the said pressure--.

Claim 3

In accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion, the claim is amended to include the language --the absorbing of the CO₂ in the polar aprotic liquid, not miscible with the water, or miscible with the water in various proportions--.

Claim 6

The definite article “the” is incorporated in the claim in accordance with the Examiner’s suggested change so as to include the language --the absorbing of the CO₂ in the aqueous phase containing the alcohol and/or the amine--.

Claim 7

The Examiner’s suggested language is adopted by incorporating the expression --the absorbing of the CO₂ in the hydrated form being activated by the enzymatic pathway--.

Claim 11

The expression “the aqueous solution obtained” is now changed to --resultant aqueous solution obtained--.

Referring to page 6 of the Office Action starting at the third line from the bottom, claim 1 is now extensively amended by incorporating the “structural cooperative relationships” between step (a) in claim 1 and step (a) in claim 4. It is to be noted that claim 1 is a generic claim which includes numerous alternative steps for concentrating CO₂ in the liquid phase. Claim 4, on the other hand, is a single species of a step of concentrating CO₂ into liquid phase, comprising absorbing of CO₂ in an aprotic ionic liquid not miscible with water or miscible with water in various proportions. Conversely, claim 4 does not claim liquefaction of CO₂ under pressure.

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review of the claims which has enabled Counsel for Applicants to make the necessary corrections. If any of the changes set forth in the present application are not appropriate, or in the event of any further “indefiniteness”, the Examiner is hereby given the authority to make the necessary changes in the claims in order to provide the requisite degree of definiteness.

If there are any residual problems, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone Counsel’s assistant, Ms. Richardson at 703-812-5326, and she will be pleased to enlist the services of another attorney.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/I. William Millen/

I. William Millen, Reg. No. 19,544
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410
Attorney Docket No.: PET-2254

Date: November 28, 2011

IWM:pdf